



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE AUTHORSHIP AND THE DATE OF THE DOUBLE LETTERS IN OVID'S *HEROIDES*¹

BY SERENO BURTON CLARK

THE problem with which this article deals can offer no claim to the attention of students of the classics by reason of its novelty. Expressions of doubt as to the genuineness of some of Ovid's *Heroides* occur as early as the Renaissance editions, and the question has been considered by various scholars from that time to the present. That it is, however, by no means settled is evident from the wide divergence of opinion existing among investigators to-day; to cite but two recent views, Schanz² refuses to accept letters 16-21 as Ovidian, while Purser³ maintains their genuineness. The present study of the question is prompted by the hope that a new treatment from a slightly different point of view may yield some fresh material for the solution of this difficult problem.

A review of the opinions held by all who have given their attention to the subject is foreign to my purpose,⁴ but certain facts and tendencies are worth noting. The greatest diversity of view has prevailed: Lehrs⁵ refused to believe that any one of the twenty-one letters was written in its entirety by Ovid, while others, as Loers⁶ and, more recently, Piéri⁷ and Purser,⁸ contend that they were all composed by

¹ This article is a revised form of a dissertation entitled *Utrum Ovidius Epistulas Heroidum XVI-XXI scripserit et quo tempore quaeritur*, accepted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Harvard University in 1907.

² *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, 2te Aufl., München, 1899, § 296.

³ Palmer, *Ovidi Heroides*, Oxford, 1898, p. xxxii.

⁴ For the history of the question see Sedlmayer in *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien*, XXX (1879), p. 816, and Schanz, *l. l.*

⁵ *Jahrbücher für Philologie*, LXXXVII (1863), pp. 49 ff.; cf. also his edition of Horace, Leipzig, 1869, pp. ccxii ff.

⁶ *Ovidii Heroides*, Coloniae, 1829, pp. xxxviii ff.

⁷ *Quaestiones ad P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulas Heroidum*, etc., Massiliae, 1895, p. 89.

⁸ *l. l.*

him. The history of the question, however, may be said to begin with Lachmann,¹ for his was the first scientific treatment, and all subsequent investigators owe much to him. From an examination of the language and metre of the *Heroides* he concluded that only those letters could be ascribed to Ovid which the poet himself enumerates in *Amores* 2, 18, 21 ff., namely, 1, 2, 4-7, 10, and 11. Lachmann's views long held the field, owing rather to the authority of his name than to the weight of his arguments. These have indeed been partly overthrown by later workers, among whom appear L. Müller,² Birt,³ Eschenburg,⁴ and Tolkiehn,⁵ so that to-day no one doubts the Ovidian authorship of *Heroides* 1-14. As to the Sappho letter (15) there is not the same unanimity of opinion, for some, e. g., Teuffel-Schwabe,⁶ still consider it a forgery; but for many the work of de Vries⁷ has settled the question in Ovid's favor, and Palmer, who excluded letters 15-21 from his first edition of the *Heroides*, declares in his second edition⁸ for the genuineness of 15. Recent treatments of the *Heroides* have therefore usually considered the last six letters by themselves, a method the more natural because the inclusion of letters by men makes the title, *Heroidum Epistulae*, not strictly appropriate, and because the double letters are further distinguished from the first fifteen by their greater length.

Over these six letters the discussion has been long continued, yet though scholars of note have believed them spurious, a study of the literature from Lachmann's day to the present reveals a growing unwillingness on the part of investigators to reject on account of trifling irregularities of language or metre letters which it is impossible to prove spurious on other grounds. For *Heroides* 16-21, with

¹ Berlin Program, 1848; also in *Kleinere Schriften*, II, pp. 56 ff.

² *De re metrica*, Lipsiae, 1861, pp. 46 ff.

³ *Animadversiones ad Ovidi Heroidum Epistulas*, in *Rhein. Mus.* XXXII (1877), pp. 386-432.

⁴ *Metrische Untersuchungen über die Aechtheit der Heroides des Ovid*, Lübeck Program, 1874; *Wie hat Ovid einzelne Wörter und Wortklassen im Verse verwandt?* Lübeck Program, 1886.

⁵ *Quaestionum ad Heroides Ovidianas spectantium Capita VII*, Lipsiae, 1888.

⁶ *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, Leipzig,⁵ 1890, § 248.

⁷ *Sapphus Epistula ad Phaonem*, etc., Lugduni Batavorum, 1885.

⁸ Pp. xxxi, 420.

the exception of verses 39-142 of letter 16 and verses 13-248 of letter 21, have the same manuscript authority as *Heroides* 1-14,¹ and better authority than *Heroides* 15. Further, it is manifestly absurd to reject a poem because it contains lines which in thought, diction, or metre do not attain so high a standard as other work of the same author; such a proceeding is especially dangerous in the case of Ovid, who wrote too much to write always at his best, and who was by nature not inclined to lavish upon every verse the infinite care which marks the work of Horace and Virgil. To quote Piéri:² "Nempe optimi aliquando dormitant poetae ac quasdam sibi licentias concessas esse putant, prorsusque non legis morositate obstringi se patiuntur, ut qui non in criticorum usum, sed ad oblectandos homines liberalibus studiis politos carmina componant."

No one would contend that the *Heroides* give us Ovid at his best; they are often marred by excess of rhetoric, and they are often monotonous. This latter fault is, however, due largely to the nature of the subject; it is difficult to impart variety to the woes of love-lorn heroines in similar situations, when the theme recurs eighteen times and its treatment embraces nearly 4000 lines. Furthermore, certain of the last six letters are worthy to be compared with the best of the surely genuine poems, if indeed 17 and 21 are not themselves the best of the series. In them the poet manifests his extraordinary knowledge of woman's nature, and paints with equal skill two utterly different characters, Helen, who is not unwilling to sin, but would seem unwilling, and Cydippe, the modest maiden who feels the passion of love for the first time, and after a long struggle is compelled to acknowledge its victory. Again, if the epistle of Hero (19) is inferior to the other five of the double letters and lacks variety, it is surely not less inspiring than that of Deianira (9), which is perhaps the feeblest of all, but genuine. We may then apply to these last six letters the words of Loers³ concerning 16: "In epistola autem XVI una omnia, quae his carminibus et Nasonis consuetudini propria ac singularia sunt, dixerim esse coniuncta. Idem argumentum, eadem narrationes et descriptiones, iidem sensus et

¹ Cf. Palmer in Postgate, *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, London, 1894, p. xvi.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 75.

³ *Op. cit.*, praef., p. xlvii.

affectus, idem fabulae usus, eadem in rebus, quae ad Venerem spectant, describendis cupiditas atque subtilitas, eadem humani animi cognitio et in animi amantis commotionibus pingendis calliditas." Recent scholars, too, have not failed to appreciate the Ovidian character of the double letters. Purser¹ remarks: "Even though it be proved conclusively that some of the Epistles are not by Ovid, still there is no doubt that they were written in the Ovidian style and are Ovidian Epistles. Ovid is their ancestor if not their father." "Whoever the author was, his descriptive powers were of a very high order; and there are passages, like Leander's nightly swim, to which it is difficult to find a rival in Ovid himself." Granting, then, both excellencies and defects in the double letters, we cannot infer from this inequality of workmanship that they are spurious; such an argument should no more be applied to Ovid than to Wordsworth.

Since, then, neither the manuscript authority of the last six *Heroides* nor the general character of their thought and style can be seriously impugned, the evident line of attack for those who believe them spurious is to show that they contain peculiarities varying so widely from Ovid's manner as to exclude the possibility of their genuineness. This method has been employed from the time of Lachmann to the present, and in the first section of this paper I shall attempt to show that none of these alleged peculiarities is contrary to Ovid's usage. Considering the excellent manuscript authority of the double letters, this line of argument, if successfully carried through, would demonstrate their genuineness and leave the burden of proof with those who disbelieve. But the case will be still clearer, if we can demonstrate some marked similarity between the doubtful *Heroides* and the other works of Ovid²; to such an attempt the second section of this paper will be devoted. Since the extent of this phase of the subject makes some limitation necessary, the present investigation will be confined to metrical technic. A third and final section will deal with the date of the double letters, in an endeavor to learn if any facts elicited by our previous studies will enable us to fix the time when these letters were written.

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. xxix, 437.

² Cf. Ehwald in *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, XLII-XLIII (1885), p. 209.

I

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF OVIDIAN USAGE IN *HEROIDES* 16-21

This section is chiefly a summary of the discussion concerning certain points of metre and diction in the double letters which Lachmann and his followers have declared to be irreconcilable with Ovid's known technic, but which according to Lachmann's opponents can be justified from the poet's genuine writings. As has been already stated, Lachmann considered spurious or doubtful not only *Heroides* 16-21, but also 3, 8, 9, and 12-15. However, since there is no longer any doubt of the genuineness of the first fourteen letters, I shall consider these as exhibiting, equally with Ovid's other works, his customary usage, and shall cite them accordingly.

1. In *Her.* 17 *Ledā* (l. 55) and *Aethrā* (l. 150) are found instead of the Greek forms *Ledē* and *Aethrē*.¹ *Ledā*, however, appears in *Her.* 8 (l. 78), also rejected by Lachmann, and in *Amor.* 2, 4, 42, where he wished to read *Lydā*; while in *A. A.* 1, 744 we find *Phaedrā*, for which he desired to substitute *Cressā*. These emendations have no justification,² and Leyhausen³ cites still other examples, apparently overlooked by Lachmann: *Ariadnā* (*A. A.* 3, 35); *Atalanťā* (*Met.* 10, 598), but the genitive *Atalanťēs* (*Amor.* 3, 2, 29); *Bacchā* (*Her.* 10, 48; *A. A.* 1, 312; 3, 710), but also *Bacchē* (*Amor.* 1, 14, 21); *Neaerā* (*Amor.* 3, 6, 28). Purser⁴ adds also: *Aetnā* (*Met.* 5, 352); *Cassandrā* (*Amor.* 1, 7, 17); *Cretā* (*A. A.* 1, 298); *Europā* (*Met.* 8, 120); *Idā* (*Her.* 5, 138; 16, 110). However, Greek forms are also common, e. g., *Lydē* (*Amor.* 1, 10, 3); *Semelē* and *Ledē* (*A. A.* 3, 251), and, in the ablative, *Cyllenē* (*Met.* 1, 217), *Hesionē* (*Met.* 11, 217); and there is a strong probability in favor of Müller's view that the poet's choice was determined by the metre, varying according as he needed a short or long final syllable. Such an array of examples from Ovid's own works fully answers Lachmann's objection to *Ledā* and *Aethrā* in letter 17.

¹ Lachmann, *Kleinere Schriften*, II, p. 59.

² Cf. L. Müller, *De re metrica*, p. 389, and *Rhein. Mus.* XVIII (1863), p. 88; Eschenburg, *Metr. Untersuch.*, p. 20.

³ *Helenae et Herus Epistulae Ovidii non sunt*, Halis Saxonum, 1893, p. 10.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. xxx.

2. In *Her.* 19, 170 *nihil* must be read as a pyrrhic, *nīhil*, to give a dactyl in the second half of the pentameter. Lachmann¹ held that this metrical value is unknown in Ovid's genuine works, where, he maintained, the word always appears as an iambus (υ-), or, by synizesis, with the value of a long syllable (-). Müller,² however, cites two other passages where *nihil* occurs in the concluding member of the pentameter and must form the second half of a dactyl:

(a) *Trist.* 4, 8, 38, *quō nīhil ōrbis hābet*;

(b) *Trist.* 5, 8, 2, *quō nīhil ēssē pōtest*.³

In *Met.* 10, 520,⁴ *Et nihil est annis velocius*, etc., the value υυ for *nihil* is not inevitable, though certainly desirable, since the idea of rapidity calls for as 'light' a line as possible. The objection to *nīhil* in *Her.* 19, 170 is, therefore, not sustained by the facts.

3. Another metrical peculiarity to which Lachmann⁵ called attention is the elision of the final syllable of an iambic word immediately before the metrical accent, as *Her.* 17, 97, *disce meo exemplo*.⁶ This usage is indeed rare in Ovid's elegiac verse, for only one other instance is found,⁷ *Amor.* 2, 19, 20, *saepe time insidias*, which Eschenburg⁸ would emend to *saepe treme insidias*, or, following Müller,⁹ reject altogether. Merkel, however, retains the manuscript reading, and this example, with the twenty instances from the *Metamorphoses*,¹⁰ seems abundant to justify the same elision in the *Heroides*.

4. A more striking and important peculiarity noticed by Lachmann¹¹ is the use of words of more than two syllables at the end of the penta-

¹ *L. l.*

² *De re metr.*, p. 47.

³ Cf. also Merkel in his edition of Ovid, Leipzig, 1859, I, p. 10; Müller, in *Rhein. Mus.* XVIII (1863), p. 87; Eschenburg, *l. l.*

⁴ Cf. Lehrs, edition of Horace, p. ccxxiii.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 60.

⁶ Cf. Müller, *De re metr.*,² p. 341.

⁷ *Trist.* 2, 296, *viro ante fores*, is now commonly emended to *vir ante fores* because of the sense.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 2.

⁹ *Philologus*, XI (1856), p. 87.

¹⁰ *Met.* 2, 314, 315, 483, 774; 4, 86; 5, 670; 6, 359, 660; 8, 727, 819; 9, 20, 299; 10, 429; 11, 381, 693; 12, 133; 13, 74, 79, 122, 767. Cf. Eschenburg, *l. l.*

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 61.

meter in *Her.* 14, 62, *generis*; 16, 288, *pudicitiae*; 17, 16, *superciliis*; and 19, 202, *deseruit*. As *Her.* 14 is now considered genuine, the example from that letter might be used to establish the legitimacy of the other instances, were it not for the fact that the line in question (62) does not appear in the first hand of P, the best manuscript of the *Heroides*, and that the word *generis* is not found in the line which P² has added. Sedlmayer, therefore, rejects the verse, although Planudes seems to have had *generis* in his Latin text. The remaining four lines are the only examples from Ovid's early works of words of more than two syllables at the close of the pentameter. The other elegiac poets, however, do not follow so severe a rule, and their verses exhibit such endings with comparative frequency; while Ovid himself in his later works relaxes somewhat his earlier rigidity, and we find in the *Fasti* two, in the *Ibis* one, in the *Tristia* fifteen, and in the *Epistulae ex Ponto* thirty pentameter lines ending in words of more than two syllables.¹ If the poet allowed himself forty-eight exceptions in his later writings, it is reasonable to grant that he may have departed from his strict rule at least four times in his youthful productions. Furthermore, it seems likely that an imitator of Ovid—supposing that the double letters are the work of an imitator—would have noticed the poet's usual avoidance of the longer endings, and would himself have refrained altogether from their use.

5. In *Her.* 18, 121,

hoc quoque si credis: ad te via prona videtur,

the short final syllable of *credis* has the value of a long syllable under the ictus before a vowel, with the caesura intervening. Lachmann² condemns this usage, maintaining that such 'lengthening', except in the case of *-que*, occurs only before *et*, *aut*, or a Greek word. This law

¹ *Fast.* 5, 582; 6, 660; *Ibis* 520; *Trist.* 1, 3, 6; 1, 4, 20; 1, 10, 34; 2, 212; 2, 232; 2, 294; 2, 416; 2, 430; 2, 514; 3, 5, 40; 3, 9, 2; 3, 10, 4; 4, 5, 24; 4, 10, 2; 5, 6, 30; *Epist. ex Pont.* 1, 2, 70; 1, 8, 40; 2, 2, 6; 2, 2, 72; 2, 2, 78; 2, 3, 18; 2, 5, 26; 2, 9, 20; 2, 9, 42; 3, 1, 166; 3, 4, 40; 3, 6, 46; 4, 2, 10; 4, 3, 12; 4, 3, 54; 4, 5, 24; 4, 6, 6; 4, 6, 14; 4, 8, 62; 4, 9, 48; 4, 9, 80; 4, 13, 28; 4, 13, 44; 4, 13, 46; 4, 14, 4; 4, 14, 18; 4, 14, 54; 4, 15, 26. The following are rejected by Merkel-Ehwald: *Ibis* 508; *Epist. ex Pont.* 1, 1, 66; 4, 9, 26.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 59.

is indeed observed in *Fast.* 3, 105; *Met.* 2, 247; 3, 184; 6, 658; 7, 61; 7, 365; 10, 98; 12, 392; 14, 250¹; but in *Her.* 9, 141 we find

semivir occubuit in letifero Eueno.

This verse is also condemned by Lachmann, but the two examples support each other, and there seems to be no reason why lengthening should not occur before *ad* or *in* as well as before *et* or *aut*.²

6. In another of his works³ Lachmann announced as a law that Greek nouns whose dative ends in *-ei*, when employed in Latin poetry, always form their ablative in *-ē* or *-ī*, e. g., *Hippomenē* (*Met.* 10, 608), *Achillē* (*Epist. ex Pont.* 3, 3, 43), except that *Diomede*, *Ganymede*, and *Lycomede* are always found with a *short* final vowel. This rule, however, is not sustained by the facts, for Horace⁴ and Propertius⁵ use *Achillē*, while *Polynicē* appears in Statius.⁶ We find, therefore, no just ground for suspecting *Ulixē* in Ovid (*Her.* 19, 148), even though it is the only instance in his works of a violation of Lachmann's dictum.⁷

7. A further criticism of Lachmann's⁸ is directed against the use of *qui* with the meaning of *quomodo* in *Her.* 17, 213. In this sense *qui* does not occur elsewhere in Ovid, but it is found in Plautus, Terence, Cicero, and Persius, while Horace, whom Ovid imitated,⁹ employs it thus sixteen times.

These are the chief of Lachmann's criticisms, and we may now notice some points of metrical technic to which Eschenburg has called attention.

8. In *Her.* 19, 29,

utque rogem de te et scribam tibi, siquis Abydo,

a long syllable is elided in the third thesis. Such an elision does not

¹ Cf. Eschenburg, *Metr. Untersuch.*, p. 10, n. 8; p. 11, n. 18.

² Cf. Müller, in *Rhein. Mus.* XVIII (1863), p. 88 f.; Riese, in *Jahresb.* III (1874-5), p. 235; Purser, in Palmer, *Ovidi Her.*², p. xxx.

³ In *Lucretium Commentarius*, Berol., 1866,³ p. 49.

⁴ Hor. *Sat.* 2, 3, 193.

⁵ Prop. 4, 11, 40.

⁶ Stat. *Theb.* 12, 348.

⁷ Cf. Leyhausen, *Helena et Herus Epistulae*, etc., p. 13.

⁸ *Kleinere Schriften*, II, p. 59.

⁹ Cf. Zingerle, *Ovidius und sein Verhältniss zu den Vorgängern*, etc., Innsbruck, 1869-71, III.

occur elsewhere in the *Heroides* or indeed in any of Ovid's *carmina amatoria*, but it is allowed in his later works, e. g. *Fast.* 3, 585; *Epist. ex Pont.* 4, 3, 33; and in the *Metamorphoses* twelve or thirteen times.¹

9. When a hexameter verse concludes with two monosyllables, the preceding dactyl of the fifth foot consists regularly of a single word or of the last three syllables of a word.² This rule is not observed in *Her.* 20, 91, . . . *et mea, cum sit*,³ but *Her.* 12, 25 furnishes another instance . . . *nupta quod hic sit*, and Eschenburg⁴ himself cites sixteen other examples from Ovid, ten from the *Metamorphoses*, one from the *Fasti*, three from the *Tristia*, and two from the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. To some of these instances, as *Her.* 20, 91, the principle of the word-group should doubtless be applied.⁵

There remain certain peculiarities, apparently not Ovidian, discussed in the dissertation of Otto Braum, *De monosyllabis ante caesuras hexametri latini collocatis*, Marburg, 1906.

10. Braum's examination of the frequency with which a monosyllable precedes the penthemimeral caesura leads him (p. 40) to accept as genuine the single *Heroides*, including the epistle of Sappho, but to reject the double letters. In the *Heroides Ovidianae*, viz., 1, 2, 4-7, 10, 11, a monosyllable appears before this caesura once in $22\frac{2}{5}$ verses, in *Her.* 15, 16 (= 16, 17) once in $12\frac{1}{7}$, in *Her.* 17, 18 (= 18, 19) once in $15\frac{7}{9}$, in *Her.* 19, 20 (= 20, 21) once in $16\frac{1}{2}$ (p. 39); i. e., we find a difference of about 11, 7, and 7 respectively between the surely genuine *Heroides* and the three pairs of double letters. However, we may note (p. 38) that there is a difference of more than 7 between books 1 and 2 of the *Met.* (1 in $27\frac{1}{2}$, and 1 in $19\frac{4}{5}$), while between books 2 and 4 of the *Tristia* (p. 44) there is a difference of almost 14 (1 in $30\frac{3}{5}$, and 1 in $16\frac{1}{2}$). Again, in the case of Manilius (p. 36) there is a difference of 23 between books 2 and 5, and Propertius (p. 34) shows a difference of nearly 37 between books 3 and 5. These facts — which need further consideration with reference to word-

¹ Cf. Eschenburg, *Metr. Untersuch.*, pp. 4 and 14. The reading in *Met.* 12, 133 is disputed; cf. Riese, in *Fahresb.* III (1874-5), p. 234.

² Cf. L. Müller, *Catullus*, Lipsiae, 1870, Praef., p. lxvii.

³ Cf. Eschenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

⁵ See A. G. Harkness in *Class. Phil.* II (1907), pp. 51 ff.; III (1908), pp. 39 ff.

groups before statistics can be compiled—are surely sufficient to invalidate any argument based upon the much smaller variation between the genuine and the double letters of the *Heroides*.

Furthermore, it is to be observed that Braum's table on p. 75, dealing with the lines in which two closely connected monosyllables appear before the caesura, shows an extraordinary agreement among Ovid's various works; and it is equally worthy of note that the double letters have no examples of *ac* or *atque* (with *-e* elided) in the third thesis (pp. 84, 85), thus agreeing with the single letters, the *Amores*, the *Fasti*, the *Tristia*, and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, and that the double letters as well as the genuine *Heroides* show no instance of a monosyllabic preposition in this position in the verse (p. 88).

11. As regards the trithemimeral caesura, Ovid usually avoids beginning a line with a spondaic or dactylic word followed by a monosyllable immediately before the caesura. Such lines are not found in *Amor.* 1 and 3, *Fast.* 3, *Trist.* 1-5, *Epist. ex Pont.* 1, while examples from the remaining books are rare (Braum, pp. 103, 104). The double letters afford one instance of a spondaic word in the first foot followed by a monosyllable, *dicam nunc* (*Her.* 21, 55) which has been variously emended, but is supported by *illi me* of *Epist. ex Pont.* 4, 9, 99 and by *postquam se* of *Her.* 15, 113. No example appears in the double letters of a dactylic word in the first foot before a monosyllable, and *tutius est* (*Her.* 3, 117), which appears in a letter once rejected but now considered genuine and is found also in *Amor.* 2, 11, 31, affords an illustration of the danger of laying too much stress upon a very few instances of a peculiarity, as in *dicam nunc*, etc., above, or in the rare use of a dissyllable ending a pentameter line. The results of Braum's studies, therefore, do not seem to justify his conclusion that *Her.* 16-21 are spurious.

Our examination of the objections brought against the language and metre of the double letters of the *Heroides* may now be summed up as follows: some of the condemned usages¹ we have found supported by examples from Ovid's youthful and later works, others² have parallels only in the verse of his mature years, while still others stand alone³ or with only one similar instance⁴ in Ovid, but are found in other writers.

¹ Cf. under 1, 3, 9, 10, and 11.

² Cf. under 2, 4, and 8.

³ Cf. under 6 and 7.

⁴ Cf. under 5.

This evidence surely is not sufficient to establish the spuriousness of *Heroides* 16–21. If we are to reject letters 9 and 18 because of the 'lengthening' in *occubuit* and *credis*, we are justified in concluding that *Met.* 6 and *Amor.* 3, 6 are not by Ovid, for they contain the only lines (*Met.* 6, 524; *Amor.* 3, 6, 101) in which Ovid elides a dactylic word in the fifth foot.¹ If the *Metamorphoses* had chanced not to be preserved, would not the poet's critics unhesitatingly reject *Amor.* 3, 6? The verse-ending *inaequales autumnos* of *Met.* 1, 117 is unique in Ovid: shall we therefore consider the passage spurious?

In his work entitled, *Wie hat Ovid einzelne Wörter und Wortklassen im Verse verwandt?* Eschenburg subjects Ovid's works to a very minute examination; selecting certain expressions and classes of words which recur often, such as *ei mihi*, *certe ego*, nouns in *-men*, adjectives in *-bilis*, etc., he applies these tests, over twenty in number, to the *Heroides*. Without reporting the details of his results, we may quote his summary: "Fassen wir nunmehr das Gesagte kurz zusammen, so finden wir nur in zwei Fällen² eine wesentliche Abweichung zwischen den sicher echten Gedichten und den zweifelhaften Heroiden. * * * Bei einer so auffallenden Übereinstimmung zwischen der Technik Ovids und der der zweifelhaften Heroiden bin ich in meiner frühern Meinung, die angezweifelten Heroiden seien nicht von Ovid geschrieben, sehr wankend geworden, und neige ich mich jetzt entschieden der von Riese mit andern Gründen gestützten Ansicht zu, dass Ovid die uns erhaltenen Heroiden zu verschiedenen Zeiten verfasst habe, in einer frühern Periode die acht sicher echten, in einer spätern die übrigen."³ Without discussing the justice of this opinion concerning the date of the double letters, to which I shall return hereafter, we may note that Eschenburg's investigation confirms the view that the double letters deviate no more than Ovid's other works from his normal standard. As additional confirmation of this opinion we may cite the fact that

¹ Cf. Bednara, *De sermone dactylicorum Latinorum quaestiones*, in *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*, XIV, p. 329.

² *Ei mihi* is found once (*Her.* 17, 246) out of its usual position, the first place in the verse; and *certe ego* occurs once (*Her.* 20, 178) at the beginning of the second half of the pentameter, an exceptional position.

³ Eschenburg, *Wie hat Ovid*, etc., pp. 34 and 39.

studies of Ovid's syntax¹ fail to show any important differences between the double *Heroides* and the rest of Ovid's verse.² We are then, it would seem, amply justified in concluding that *Heroides* 16-21 contain practically nothing in thought, language, or metre to warrant their rejection as spurious.

II

A COMPARISON OF THE METRE OF *HEROIDES* 16-21 WITH
THAT OF OVID'S OTHER WORKS

Having shown, as I hope, in the preceding chapter that the double letters contain nothing to support the view that they are spurious, I shall now try to prove that in important matters of metrical technic they agree with Ovid's accepted works. Before treating the most significant of these peculiarities — the poet's use of dactyls and spondees — it will be well to clear the ground by examining certain minor tests. As we have seen, Ovid regularly concludes his pentameter lines with words of two syllables having the metrical value \cup or $\cup\cup$, and thus limits himself considerably in the number of words available for this place in the verse. It has seemed worth while to tabulate for purposes of comparison the facts concerning the poet's choice of words for this position. Many words occur too rarely to be of any value as tests, while others appear with greater or less frequency according to the nature of the subject matter, e. g., *amor*, *amat*, etc., are found much more frequently in the love-poems than elsewhere, and *dies* shows a much greater percentage in the *Fasti*. Furthermore, it is evident that such a test cannot furnish a positive proof in a question of genuineness, for "verse-tags" are very easily retained by the memory and would be used by any imitator. However, a close agreement between the *Heroides* and the poet's surely genuine works will prove a good negative argument in favor of the Ovidian authorship of the letters. I have included in the following table only such dissyllabic words as occur most frequently and are of a colorless nature, since these alone can offer a stable basis of comparison. The figures given indicate the percentage of pentameter lines in each work which end in the words chosen as tests.

¹ Cf. Hau, *De casuum usu Ovidiano*, Monasterii, 1884; Tolkiehn, *Quaest. ad Her. Ovid.*, etc., pp. 104-8.

² Cf. Piéri, *Quaest. ad P. Ovidii Nasonis Epist.*, etc., p. 60.

TABLE I.—CERTAIN DISSYLLABIC PENTAMETER ENDINGS

Works	<i>Amor.</i>	<i>Her.</i> 1-15	<i>Her.</i> 16-21	<i>A. A.</i>	<i>Rem.</i>	<i>Fast.</i>	<i>Trist.</i>	<i>Ex</i> <i>Pont.</i>
Dissyllabic forms of <i>do</i>	1.9%	1.6%	1.5%	1.6%	2.4%	2.2%	1.3%	1.5%
Dissyllabic forms of <i>habeo</i>	2.2	2.9	2.6	4.3	2.2	3.7	3.0	3.0
Dissyllabic forms of <i>sum</i> (imp. and fut.)	6.1	8.6	5.7	6.6	11.3	8.2	6.0	4.1
Dissyllabic forms of <i>sum</i> (perf.)	1.6	2.9	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.4	2.8	1.8
Aphaeresis of <i>est</i> after dissyllabic words	.8	1.9	2.3	1.6	2.9	1.7	2.8	1.9

It is apparent from these figures that there is less variation in every case between *Her.* 1-15 and *Her.* 16-21 than between works which are universally considered genuine, and that the total latitude of variation is slight, which is in itself a strong presumption in favor of a common author.

In his article entitled, *Animadversiones ad Ovidii Heroidum Epistulas*,¹ Birt examines, among other points, Ovid's use of the caesura, which he discusses under the following three types:

- I. *Respondit Iuno | Saturnia sancta dearum,*
- II. *Expectans | si mussaret | quae denique pausa,*
- III. *Ingenium | cum nulla | malum | sententia suadet,*

i. e., penthemimeral (I), trithemimeral with hephthemimeral (II), and trithemimeral with hephthemimeral and a caesura κατὰ τρίτον τροχαῖον (III). Type II occurs in the *Heroides* once only (2, 37). In his treatment of Type I Birt divides the hexameter lines illustrating it into four classes: (1) those with a dactyl in the first foot, (2) those with a spondee in the first foot, (3) those with a dactyl in the fourth foot, and (4) those with a spondee in the fourth foot. This method, however, seems artificial, for the caesura and the character of the first or fourth foot have no logical interrelation and each can be more advantageously studied by itself. It has therefore seemed best, since the composition of the hexameter is to be discussed hereafter, and since Type I is the

¹ *Rhein. Mus.* XXXII (1877), pp. 386 ff.

most common form of caesura in all Latin poets and consequently less characteristic, to confine our study to Type III, as being rarer and expressing more plainly the poet's individual preference. With the exception of *Met.* 1-3, the works of Ovid for which Birt¹ and Eschenburg² give statistics have been re-examined; and these figures, with some additions, constitute the following table.

TABLE II. — CAESURA, BIRT'S TYPE III

	Book 1	Book 2	Book 3	Book 4	Book 5	Book 6	Aver.
<i>Amor.</i>	8.2%	7.2	7.0	7.5
<i>Her.</i> 1-15	9.0
<i>Her.</i> 16-21	3.5
<i>A. A.</i>	9.7	14.0	8.6	10.8
<i>Rem.</i>	6.4
<i>Fast.</i>	5.8	7.1	6.9	8.1	7.1	11.6	7.8
<i>Trist.</i>	4.3	5.3	4.1	3.9	4.4
<i>Ex Pont.</i>	3.5	4.0	3.3	5.5	4.1
<i>Met.</i>	{ Bk. 1-3 10.0	{ Bk. 14 9.4	{ Bk. 15 13.0
				10.5

These statistics show a surprising divergence in different books of the same work, e. g., *Fast.* 1, 5.8%, *Fast.* 6, 11.6%. Furthermore, *Her.* 16-21 (3.5%) are seen not to agree at all with *Her.* 1-15 (9.0%), but rather with the *Tristia* (4.4%) and the *Epistulae ex Ponto* (4.1%), a phenomenon which will call for notice later.

Eschenburg³ adds to Birt's treatment of the caesura an enumeration of lines in which there is a pause κατὰ τέταρτον τροχαῖον, as in

Iunoni ante omnes, cui vincla | iugalia curae,

and gives the statistics for the *Heroides* considered genuine by Lachmann, the *Amores*, and the *Ars Amatoria*. These figures have been verified, and the count has been extended to cover the same works as Table II. The following table gives the results.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 390; *Ad historiam hexametris Latini symbola*, Bonnæ, 1876, p. 54.

² *Metr. Untersuch.*, pp. 12 and 19.

³ *L. l.*

TABLE III. — CAESURA κατὰ τέταρτον τροχαῖον

	Book 1	Book 2	Book 3	Book 4	Book 5	Book 6	Aver.
<i>Amor.</i>	4.6	6.7	5.8	5.7
<i>Her.</i> 1-15	7.1
<i>Her.</i> 16-21	5.4
<i>A. A.</i>	5.7	6.5	4.4	5.5
<i>Rem.</i>	1.5
<i>Fast.</i>	7.2	5.9	7.6	5.5	6.9	8.5	6.9
<i>Trist.</i>	3.2	5.3	5.1	4.7	4.6
<i>Ex Pont.</i>	7.0	5.1	5.3	4.8	5.6
<i>Met.</i> {	..	Bk. 14	Bk. 15
	8.8	7.3	5.4	7.2

In this case, with the exception of the *Remedia*, there is rather close agreement between the poet's several works and less divergence among the several books of the same work.

Our studies of Ovid's metre thus far can be said to have yielded only negative results; the double letters of the *Heroides* have been found to present no special peculiarities, but nothing has been discovered to prove an Ovidian authorship. A test must be sought which will show a positive resemblance between *Her.* 16-21 and the poet's other works, and such a test will be found in the composition of the verse; for, while a careful imitator who was thoroughly familiar with the work of his model might succeed in reproducing the beginning and endings of verses, the favorite expressions, and perhaps even the caesuras of the original, it is extremely unlikely that he would so arrange dactyls and spondees either unconsciously or by intent as to produce the same results, measured by exact statistics, which appear in his pattern. This will appear more plainly as we proceed.

The beginning of a minute and scientific study of the Greek and the Latin hexameter was made by Drobisch in his treatise entitled *Ein statistischer Versuch über die Formen des lateinischen Hexameters*.¹ Since the fifth foot of the hexameter is usually a dactyl and the sixth foot always contains two syllables, forming either a trochee or a spon-

¹ In the *Berichte über die Verhandl. der königl. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 1866.

dee, Drobisch disregards this portion of the verse and considers only the first four feet. The rare verses with a spondaic fifth foot he excludes from this portion of his treatment. In the first four feet sixteen different arrangements of dactyls and spondees are possible. These, with illustrations from Ovid, chosen by Hultgren,¹ are given below, *d* representing 'dactyl' and *s* 'spondee.'

1. *dsss*: Conscia mens recti famae mendacia risit.
2. *dsds*: Disce bonas artes, moneo, Romana iuventus.
3. *dssd*: Pectoribus mores tot sunt quot in urbe figurae.
4. *dsdd*: Tempora labuntur tacitisque senescimus annis.
5. *ddss*: Regia, crede mihi, res est succurrere lapsis.
6. *ddds*: Mitius ille perit subita qui mergitur unda.
7. *ddsd*: Gutta cavat lapidem: consumitur annulus usu.
8. *dddd*: Omnia deficiunt, animus tamen omnia vincit.
9. *sdsd*: Curando fieri quaedam maiora videmus.
10. *sdds*: Non hic pampineis amicitur vitibus ulmus.
11. *sdsd*: Cur sit virgineis, quaeris, dea culta ministris?
12. *sddd*: Scribentem iuvat ipse favor minuitque laborem.
13. *ssss*: Iurabant omnes in laesi iura mariti.
14. *ssds*: Ut desint vires tamen est laudanda voluntas.
15. *sssd*: Quid cessas currum pompamque parare triumphis?
16. *ssdd*: Pro Troia, Romane, tua Venus arma ferebat.

With this scheme as a basis, Drobisch examines about five hundred hexameter lines from each of the following Latin poets: Ennius, Cicero, Lucretius, Catullus, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Manilius, Persius, Juvenal, Lucan, Silius Italicus, Valerius Flaccus, Statius, and Claudian; and in his tables gives the various forms of verse in the order of frequency, with the percentage for each. From these figures he derives the percentage of dactyls and spondees occurring in each of the first four feet. A further classification divides the lines into (1) *balanced* hexameters, in which two of the first four feet are dactyls and two spondees; (2) *dactylic* hexameters, which contain three or four dactyls in the first four feet; and (3) *spondaic* hexameters, in which spondees predomi-

¹ *Observationes metricalae in poetis elegiacos*, Lipsiae, Program des Nicolaigymnasium, 1871-2, I, p. 4.

nate. According to this classification the sixteen forms of verse are subdivided as follows :

Balanced hexameters	Dactylic hexameters	Spondaic hexameters
dsds	dsdd	dsdd
dssd	ddds	sdss
ddss	ddsd	ssss
sdds	dddd	ssds
sdsd	sddd	sssd
ssdd		

Drobisch had confined his studies to the Latin poets who use continuous hexameters, but Hultgren in his *Observationes metricae in poetas elegiacos* extends the same method to include all the hexameter and pentameter lines of the chief elegiac poets, both Greek and Latin. Because of the constant character of the second half of the pentameter, only the first half calls for consideration, and here only four variations of dactyl and spondee are possible : *dd, ds, sd, ss*. Hultgren also indicates in his tables the number and percentage of dactylic and spondaic first feet in both hexameter and pentameter, and the number and percentage of words of one, two, three, etc., syllables used to conclude the lines. To answer any objection which may arise later because of a comparison of the epic with the elegiac hexameter, we may here quote Hultgren's¹ conclusion after a study and comparison of the two : *Hexameter epicus Latinorum, excepto bisyllabo fine praeponderante, fere nihil distat ab hexametro elegiaco*. Furthermore, since the second half of the pentameter always contains two dactyls, there can be no *spondaic* pentameter, but only (1) the *balanced*, in which the first two feet are spondees, and (2) the *dactylic*, in which one or both of these are dactyls. Putting this in tabular form, we have :

Balanced pentameter	Dactylic pentameters
ss	ds
	sd
	dd

From the investigations of these scholars² one thing in particular is

¹ *Op. cit.*, II, p. 3.

² Further studies by Drobisch and Hultgren, of less immediate interest to our purpose, are found in the *Berichte über die Verhandl. der königl. sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Leipzig*, vols. XXIII (1871), XXIV (1872), XXV (1873), XXVII (1875).

apparent: each poet has his own favorite ways of arranging dactyls and spondees in the line, and no two poets exhibit the same preferences, although a general similarity may sometimes be discerned; e. g. Lucretius, Horace, Manilius, Persius, Iuvenal, and Lucan may all be grouped with Virgil as forming a type by themselves. To take the case of Ovid as compared with the other fourteen poets whose use of the epic hexameter has been treated by Drobisch, a study of the tables prepared by that scholar¹ shows that Ovid is sharply distinguished from all the rest by four peculiarities: (1) he uses a larger proportion of dactyls in the first four feet than any of the other Latin poets who employ the same metre; (2) he surpasses them all in the number of 'dactylic' lines, i. e., those in which dactyls predominate;² (3) his works exhibit a larger proportion of lines which begin with a dactyl, and this preference is carried so far that (4) *all* the eight forms of verse beginning with a dactyl are in his poetry more common than *any* of the eight with a spondee in the first place, a phenomenon which is found nowhere else. The first of these characteristics is best seen by referring to Drobisch's table,³ which I here present with his figures subtracted from 100% in order to show the percentage of dactyls instead of spondees.

TOTAL NUMBER OF DACTYLS

Ovid	54.8%	Virgil, <i>Georg.</i>	44.3%
Valerius Flaccus . . .	53.3	Virgil, <i>Aen.</i>	43.6
Statius	49.4	Lucretius	42.6
Lucan	45.7	Manilius	41.1
Horace	45.0	Ennius	40.5
Claudian	44.9	Silius Italicus	39.4
Persius	44.8	Cicero	36.8
Iuvenal	44.4	Catullus	34.2

It is evident from these statistics that Ovid not only surpasses all others in his fondness for the dactyl, but is the only poet except Valerius Flaccus, his imitator, who uses more than 50% dactyls. Of his predecessors, Horace stands nearest to him, and still is 9% away.

¹ Cf. *op. cit.*, XVIII (1866), pp. 130, 135-7.

² Cf. pp. 136, 137.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 135.

That Ovid's verse is also conspicuous for its large number of 'dactylic' lines is shown by another of Drobisch's tables.¹

DACTYLIC VERSES			
Ovid	35.7%	Virgil, <i>Georg.</i>	19.3%
Valerius Flaccus	31.6	Lucan	18.75
Statius	28.8	Lucretius	18.4
Horace	21.2	Manilius	16.2
Ennius	21.2	Silius Italicus	15.0
Iuvenal	20.5	Claudian	14.5
Persius	19.9	Cicero	12.5
Virgil, <i>Aen.</i>	19.9	Catullus	7.2

A comparison of these two tables yields some interesting results, and for convenience of reference they are here repeated and arranged in parallel columns.

TOTAL NUMBER OF DACTYLS		DACTYLIC VERSES	
1. Ovid	54.8%	Ovid	35.7%
2. Valerius Flaccus	53.3	Valerius Flaccus	31.6
3. Statius	49.4	Statius	28.8
4. Lucan	45.7	Horace	21.2
5. Horace	45.0	Ennius	21.2
6. Claudian	44.9	Iuvenal	20.5
7. Persius	44.8	Persius	19.9
8. Iuvenal	44.4	Virgil, <i>Aen.</i>	19.9
9. Virgil, <i>Georg.</i>	44.3	Virgil, <i>Georg.</i>	19.3
10. Virgil, <i>Aen.</i>	43.6	Lucan	18.75
11. Lucretius	42.6	Lucretius	18.4
12. Manilius	41.1	Manilius	16.2
13. Ennius	40.5	Silius Italicus	15.0
14. Silius Italicus	39.4	Claudian	14.5
15. Cicero	36.8	Cicero	12.5
16. Catullus	34.2	Catullus	7.2

The cases of Lucan, Claudian, and Ennius are especially worthy of note, for while the two former rank fourth and sixth in the total number of dactyls employed, they occupy only the tenth and fourteenth places in the number of 'dactylic' verses; but Ennius ranks thirteenth in the first table and fifth in the second. In this is manifest Ennius' artistic gift, since he understands how to give variety and color to his ordinarily slow and heavy verse by employing a considerable number of lines

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 136.

where dactyls predominate. Lucan and Claudian, on the other hand, although they use many more dactyls than Ennius, distribute them evenly through their verse, have a small proportion of 'dactylic' verses, and hence lack the variety of Ennius. It is plain, therefore, that it does not follow that because Ovid uses the greatest percentage of dactyls he will also stand first in the number of 'dactylic' verses. His holding first rank in this regard is then a further distinguishing mark of his metre.

This decided preference of Ovid for the dactyl appears especially in the first and fourth feet, the beginnings of the two halves of the hexameter. In the first foot he uses a dactyl in 83.2% of his lines, while in the fourth foot, which is commonly a favorite place for spondees, we find the percentage of spondees only 52.7. All the other poets in Drobisch's list, with the exception of Valerius Flaccus, employ the dactyl in the first foot in less than 70% of the total number of lines (Flaccus shows 80%, due again to his imitation of Ovid); and all the others, without exception, use more than 63% of spondees in the fourth foot, which is 10% more than the proportion used by Ovid. The complete statistics are found in Drobisch's tables,¹ and a reference to them will show that Ovid's fondness for the dactyl in the first foot is so great that, as already stated, all the eight most common forms of the sixteen possible arrangements of dactyls and spondees in the hexameter begin in Ovid's verse with a dactyl. This phenomenon is peculiar to Ovid, and forms the fourth distinguishing mark of his metrical technic.

If Tibullus and Propertius had, like Catullus, written epic hexameters, it would be unnecessary to speak separately of the elegiac hexameter, since it presents practically no peculiarity. However, to consider it briefly, Hultgren's tables VII, X, XIII, XV, and XVII² show that neither Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, nor the Lygdamus poems, but Ovid alone, in his elegiac as in his epic hexameter, exhibits a dactylic beginning in all the eight most common forms of verse. His pre-eminence over the other elegiac poets in the number of dactyls employed, the number of dactylic verses, and the percentage of lines

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 130.

² *Observ. metr.*; for Lygdamus cf. Plessis, *Traité de métrique grecque et latine*, Paris, 1889, pp. 283-6.

beginning with a dactyl may be seen from the following table,¹ where the extreme figures for the several works of each poet are given, e. g., 34%–38.9%.

TABLE IV. — HEXAMETER OF THE ELEGIAC POETS

	Total Number of Dactyls	Dactylic Verses	Verses Beginning with a Dactyl
Catullus	34.0–38.9%	8.6–12.2%	57.0–65.4%
Tibullus 1 and 2* . . .	44.9–48.7	20.1–24.3	70.4–78.7
Propertius	40.3–45.5	14.9–20.9	56.8–71.9
Lygdamus	40.1	17.1	56.7
Ovid	52.5–56.4	24.0–41.5	70.0–89.1

* Book 3 is excluded as spurious. The figures are: Total number of dactyls, 39.3%; dactylic verses, 15.9%; verses beginning with a dactyl, 55.9%.

It now remains to speak briefly of Hultgren's studies in the pentameter of the elegiac poets. The four possible arrangements of dactyl and spondee in the first half of the verse are: *dd*, *ds*, *sd*, *ss*. The order of frequency of occurrence in the several poets is as follows:² in Catullus, *ds*, *ss*, *dd*, *sd*; in Tibullus, *ds*, *dd*, *ss*, *sd*; in Propertius, *ds*, *dd*, *sd*, *ss*; in Lygdamus, *ds*, *ss*, *dd*, *sd*; in some of Ovid's works, *ds*, *dd*, *sd*, *ss*, in others, *ds*, *dd*, *ss*, *sd*. The following table contains the statistics for the total number of dactyls, the number of dactylic verses, and the number of verses beginning with a dactyl.³

TABLE V. — PENTAMETER OF THE ELEGIAC POETS

	Total Number of Dactyls	Dactylic Verses	Verses Beginning with a Dactyl
Catullus	32.0–41.3%	54.7–71.3%	37.1–55.0%
Tibullus 1 and 2* . . .	54.8–55.3	89.1–90.5	79.8–85.1
Propertius	52.2–57.9	82.5–92.1	66.7–79.3
Lygdamus	44.8	73.9	59.5
Ovid	54.0–60.8	84.3–92.1	73.4–81.8

* The figures for Book 3 are: Total number of dactyls, 49.7%; dactylic verses, 84.0%; verses beginning with a dactyl, 58.5%.

¹ Cf. Hultgren, *op. cit.*, Tab. VIII, XI, XIII, XVII; Plessis, *l. l.*

² Hultgren, *op. cit.*, Tab. IX, XII, XIV, XIX; Plessis, *l. l.*

³ Hultgren, *l. l.*; Plessis, *l. l.*

In the order of the various forms of verse Ovid, as has already been seen, presents no distinguishing mark, and this indeed is scarcely to be expected where the latitude for variation is so slight; but in the pentameter as in the hexameter there appears the same preference for the dactyl, especially in the first place in the verse.¹ In this particular, however, Tibullus surpasses Ovid; and, furthermore, owing to the fact that the various works of the same poet differ widely and that some of the percentages for other of the elegiac writers closely approximate the figures for Ovid's verse, it is unsafe to draw any decided conclusions from the statistics for the pentameter. It is in the manipulation of the hexameter, as we have seen, that the poet's individuality is chiefly displayed; and while our investigation of *Heroides* 16-21 will cover both pentameter and hexameter, the latter must be the principal instrument in an endeavor to test the Ovidian character of the metre of the double letters.²

Having completed our rather lengthy survey of the distinguishing characteristics of Ovid's metrical technic, let us now turn to the poems which are the special subject of our study, to discover whether or not these characteristics are present in them. In his treatment of the *Heroides* Hultgren divides them into two classes, those considered genuine (1-13, 18, 21) and those considered spurious (14-17, 19, 20) by L. Müller,³ and his figures are consequently of no assistance to one who is dealing with the double letters as a group. I have, therefore, collected the facts for each of the twenty-one letters and, for purposes of comparison, for the elegy on the death of Tibullus (*Amor.* 3, 9). The text used is that of Sedlmayer, and all doubted or defective distichs have been excluded from the count. I will not present here the statistics for all the separate letters, but remark merely that some of them seem at variance with what we have previously found to be a

¹ Cf. Hilberg, *Die Gesetze der Wortstellung im Pentameter des Ovid*, Leipzig, 1894, pp. 657 ff.

² The process of lightening both hexameter and pentameter — but especially the pentameter — begins with Tibullus; Propertius follows his lead, though lagging somewhat behind; while Ovid closely approximates Tibullus's usage in the pentameter, and surpasses it in the hexameter. This ability to write rapid verse, acquired in his early period, Ovid applies to continuous hexameters in the *Metamorphoses*.

³ *De re metr.*, pp. 46 ff.

characteristic of Ovid, for forms with a spondaic beginning appear among the eight most frequent types of the hexameter. These exceptions occur in both the genuine and the doubted *Heroides*,¹ and, moreover, this increase in the number of spondees is not found in some of the poems of a grave or serious nature, such as *Her.* 2, 11, 20, 21 and *Amor.* 3, 9, as one would naturally expect. Before proceeding further, therefore, it will be well to estimate how far, if it all, Ovid's metrical technic is influenced by the nature of his subject. For this purpose I have chosen poems whose theme is serious (*Her.* 11, 20, 21) or sad (*Amor.* 3, 9, the elegy on the death of Tibullus) for comparison with others of a light or satirical character (*Her.* 6, 16, 17 and *A. A.*²). In the following table are given the statistics for the total number of dactyls, the dactylic verses, and verses with dactylic beginning in both hexameter and pentameter.

TABLE VI.

	Hexameter			Pentameter		
	Total Number of Dactyls	Dactylic Verses	Verses Beginning with a Dactyl	Total Number of Dactyls	Dactylic Verses	Verses Beginning with a Dactyl
<i>Her.</i> 11 . . .	58.1%	41.9%	91.9%	65.3%	93.6%	83.9%
<i>Her.</i> 20 . . .	52.9	36.6	83.4	52.1	85.8	71.6
<i>Her.</i> 21 . . .	51.1	24.9	79.8	53.2	84.7	74.2
<i>Amor.</i> 3, 9 . .	56.6	38.2	88.2	57.4	88.2	82.4
<i>Her.</i> 6	60.2	47.4	83.6	63.7	96.2	93.7
<i>Her.</i> 16 . . .	52.2	25.4	91.9	56.8	84.9	80.0
<i>Her.</i> 17 . . .	53.9	35.4	82.7	53.8	82.7	66.9
<i>A. A.</i>	55.0	36.3	82.9	60.5	91.1	81.7

In almost every case the first group is found to equal the second in the proportion of dactyls employed, and in several instances the more serious poems are more dactylic in character than those of lighter tone.

¹ *Her.* 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21.

² Cf. Hultgren, *op. cit.*, Tab. XVIII, XIX. The strong resemblance in tone between these *Heroides* and the *Ars Amatoria* may be seen by a comparison of the following passages: *Her.* 16, 201-11 and *A. A.* 2, 367-72; *Her.* 18, 88 and *A. A.* 1, 571; *Her.* 17, 191 and *A. A.* 3, 435.

From these rather surprising facts we must conclude that Ovid's large use of the dactyl is prompted by a desire to give his verse rapidity, a quality in which he surpasses all other Latin poets, and that he does not appreciably vary his method in describing widely different emotions. While this conclusion places Ovid on a distinctly lower level than an artist in metre like Virgil, it demonstrates a uniformity in his verse which is of great value when different portions of his work are to be compared. It is now evident that the presence in certain *Heroides* of forms with a spondee in the first foot among the eight most frequent types is due to the small number of lines in each letter and not to the design of the poet; for where the number of verses is limited, some forms of the hexameter may not occur at all, and a very few examples more or less will entirely change the sequence of the various forms, e. g., in *Her.* 8, where the number of verses is only 56, forms *ssdd*, *sssd*, *ssds*, *ssss* are not found at all, and form *sdsd* occurs six times, forms *dlss* and *dsds* five times each, and forms *ddds*, *dsdd*, and *dsds* four times each, whereas if the numbers had chanced to be the reverse—four, five, and six times—the form *sdsd* would occupy the ninth place and no form with spondaic beginning would be found among the first eight. This difficulty arising from the brevity of the letters may be avoided and a more accurate representation of the facts obtained by combining several epistles, and such a method is justified by the comparative uniformity of Ovid's metre, which has been already demonstrated. I have therefore united *Her.* 1–15 to form one large section and *Her.* 16–21 to form another. The statistics for *Her.* 1–15 will appear later in Tables VIII and X, but a conspectus of the hexameter of the double letters is contained in the following table.¹

¹ It is not my purpose to discuss the text of *Her.* 16, 39–144 and *Her.* 21, 13–248. The manuscript authority is, to be sure, unsatisfactory, and scholars are divided on the question of the genuineness of these lines (cf. Sedlmayer, *Prolegomena critica ad Heroides Ovidianas*, Vindobonae, 1878, pp. 32 ff.); but since, as my figures have shown (cf. also Sedlmayer, *op. cit.*, p. 33), they present no metrical peculiarities, and inasmuch as verses 39–144 cannot be withdrawn from letter 16 without injury to the sense, and letter 21 is one of the best examples of Ovid's power of depicting woman's emotions, the lines in question have been included in the tables of the double letters.

TABLE VII.—HEXAMETER OF *Heroides* 16-21.

dssd	128	16.6%
ds ss	122	15.8
ddss	100	12.9
ddsd	85	11.0
ds ds	73	9.4
ds dd	64	8.3
dddd	47	6.1
ddds	46	5.9
sd sd	30	3.9
sd ss	15	1.9
ss ss	14	1.8
{ sdds	11	1.4
{ ssdd	11	1.4
{ sddd	9	1.2
{ ssdd	9	1.2
{ ssds	9	1.2
	773	100.0
Total No. of dact.	1659	53.7
Dactylic verses	251	32.5
First foot dact.	665	86.0
Fourth foot dact.	383	49.5

A comparison of these figures with the results of Drobisch's study of the epic poets¹ and Hultgren's study of the elegiac poets² shows that *Heroides* 16-21 agree with Ovid and with none other of these writers, whether epic or elegiac; for all the others use spondees much more often than does the author of *Heroides* 16-21, especially in the first foot, and show forms with a spondaic beginning even among the eight most frequent types. In the double letters, on the other hand, the first eight forms all begin with a dactyl, thus proving the correctness of my supposition that the apparent exceptions in the individual letters are due to the small number of lines. We therefore find in the hexameter of *Heroides* 16-21 the marks which were seen to be characteristic of Ovid's metrical technic.³ As it is possible to determine the extent of this agreement

¹ Cf. p. 139.² Cf. p. 141.³ Cf. p. 138.

only by a comparison of all the poet's works, I have gathered in Table VIII the results of our examination of *Heroides* 1-15 and *Heroides* 16-21 together with Hultgren's¹ figures for the rest of Ovid's elegiac verse and Drobisch's² statistics for *Met.* 1-3. Where their figures are for separate books I have given the average, and to facilitate comparison the forms of verse are arranged in the same order as in Table VII.

The order in which the various forms of verse appear differs somewhat in the several works, as was to be expected, and in the *De Medicamine Faciei* there are among the first eight types some with spondaic beginnings. This anomaly we may, however, at once explain as due to the shortness of the poem (50 distichs), as in the case of several of the individual *Heroides*, and it does not disprove Ovid's general usage. We should note the close agreement between the various works and especially the fact that the figures for the total number of dactyls, the dactylic verses, and the dactylic character of the first and fourth feet in the case of the double letters fall in every instance between the extreme limits found in works whose genuineness is never doubted. These characteristics, together with the dactylic beginning of the eight most frequent verse-forms, are the marks which have been found to distinguish Ovid from all other poets; they are all present in *Heroides* 16-21, and while it is perhaps conceivable that an imitator, either through knowledge of Ovid's works and a feeling for his style or by deliberate scrutiny of his own use of dactyls and spondees, could produce such agreement with the rest of Ovid's verse, this is a hypothesis which cannot deserve consideration unless other evidence, some unmistakable sign of spuriousness, drives us to it. While I shall have recourse to other arguments, it is upon this extraordinary agreement in the technic of the hexameter between *Heroides* 16-21 and Ovid's genuine works that I mainly rest my belief that the double letters cannot be the work of an imitator, but must have been written by Ovid himself.

Let us now turn to a consideration of the pentameter. Table IX gives the statistics for the double letters.

¹ *Observ. metr.*, Tab. XV, XVII.

² *Berichte der säch. Gesellschaft*, vol. XXV (1873), p. 23.

TABLE VIII. — HEXAMETER OF OVID'S WORKS

	<i>Amor.</i>	<i>Her. 1-15</i>	<i>Her. 16-21</i>	<i>A. A.</i>	<i>Rem.</i>	<i>Med. Fac.</i>	<i>Met. 1-3.</i>	<i>Fast.</i>	<i>Trist.</i>	<i>Ex Pont.</i>	<i>Ibis</i>
<i>dsds</i>	11.6%	13.8%	16.6%	11.9%	9.8%	12.0%	12.0%	15.0%	17.0%	13.3%	14.3%
<i>dsds</i>	13.4	11.0	15.8	12.9	16.0	12.0	13.4	16.2	13.0	15.8	13.1
<i>dsds</i>	12.9	9.0	12.9	12.2	13.8	12.0	13.4	12.3	12.4	13.4	10.3
<i>dsds</i>	10.9	14.3	11.0	10.6	10.3	0	11.3	11.7	11.5	11.7	17.4
<i>dsds</i>	10.2	9.8	9.4	11.8	10.1	14.0	11.2	12.4	11.0	11.5	10.9
<i>dsds</i>	6.5	8.5	8.3	7.6	6.9	6.0	7.0	9.9	8.0	7.0	7.2
<i>dsds</i>	6.4	7.4	6.1	6.3	6.6	10.0	4.9	5.3	5.6	4.7	4.7
<i>dsds</i>	7.2	7.9	5.9	9.7	8.4	4.0	9.4	7.4	8.8	8.1	7.2
<i>dsds</i>	3.5	4.7	3.9	2.8	2.7	4.0	3.8	2.0	3.1	2.7	1.9
<i>dsds</i>	4.4	2.7	1.9	3.0	5.6	10.0	4.3	2.9	3.8	2.9	3.4
<i>dsds</i>	1.8	1.5	1.8	1.7	0.7	0	1.2	1.3	2.2	1.6	1.9
<i>dsds</i>	3.9	3.1	1.4	2.8	1.5	6.0	2.5	1.5	1.6	1.9	2.8
<i>dsds</i>	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.5	4.0	1.0	0.8	0.6	1.4	0
<i>dsds</i>	1.4	1.7	1.2	2.2	2.4	4.0	1.9	0.8	1.0	0.9	1.2
<i>dsds</i>	1.9	1.7	1.2	1.3	1.7	0	1.3	0.8	0.6	1.7	2.8
<i>dsds</i>	3.4	1.6	1.2	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.4	0.9
Total No. of dact. . .	53.3	56.9	53.7	55.0	53.6	52.5	54.8	54.0	53.9	53.1	54.6
Dactylic verses . . .	32.5	39.9	32.5	36.3	41.5	24.0	34.5	33.9	33.2	32.5	37.7
First foot dact. . . .	79.2	81.8	86.0	83.0	81.8	70.0	82.5	89.1	86.9	85.6	85.0
Fourth foot dact. . .	43.8	53.4	49.5	43.9	41.9	40.0	43.2	45.9	47.5	43.5	49.5

TABLE IX. — PENTAMETER OF *Heroides* 16-21

ds	397	51.4%
dd	191	24.7
ss	107	13.8
sd	78	10.1
	773	100.0
Total No. of dact.	857	55.4
Dactylic verses	666	86.2
First foot dact.	588	76.1

As we have previously observed,¹ Ovid differs less from the other elegiac poets in his use of the pentameter than in his use of the hexameter because they all vary considerably in different portions of their work; the above table, however, shows the same large use of the dactyl which has everywhere characterized Ovid's work. To facilitate a comparison of *Heroides* 16-21 with Ovid's other poems I have gathered in one table the statistics for all the pentameter lines, as was done in the case of the hexameter.²

TABLE X. — PENTAMETER OF OVID'S WORKS

	<i>Amor.</i>	<i>Her.</i> 1-15	<i>Her.</i> 16-21	<i>A.A.</i>	<i>Rem.</i>	<i>Med.</i> <i>Fac.</i>	<i>Fast.</i>	<i>Trist.</i>	<i>Ex</i> <i>Pont.</i>	<i>Ibis</i>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
ds	51.5	49.2	51.4	51.7	50.6	56.0	53.4	48.2	49.7	40.2
dd	26.4	32.9	24.7	29.9	30.2	18.0	25.8	27.7	25.1	30.2
ss	11.3	7.2	13.8	8.9	8.6	10.0	11.3	12.5	14.2	10.3
sd	10.8	10.7	10.1	9.5	10.6	16.0	9.5	11.6	11.0	10.3
Total No. of dact.	57.5	62.9	55.4	60.5	60.8	54.0	57.3	57.6	55.5	60.0
Dactylic verses . .	88.7	92.8	86.2	91.1	91.4	90.0	88.7	87.6	85.5	89.7
First foot dact. . .	77.8	82.2	76.1	81.7	80.8	74.0	79.2	75.9	74.8	79.4

¹ Cf. p. 142.² Cf. Hultgren, *Observ. metr.*, Tab. XIX; Drobisch, *Berichte der säch. Gesell.*, vol. XXIII (1871), pp. 29-32.

We should note here that the various works of Ovid differ less from each other than those of the other elegiac poets,¹ and that, as in the case of the hexameter, the figures for *Heroides* 16-21 fall in every case between the extreme limits found in genuine works. It is also worthy of observation that the order of verse-forms which appears in the double letters, i. e., *ds*, *dd*, *ss*, *sd*, is found in the poet's early works only in *Amores* 3,² but tends to become regular in his later writings.

We may now consider another point, already mentioned, in which Ovid's pentameter differs from that of the other elegiac poets, namely, his preference for concluding the line with words of two syllables. The following table gives a conspectus of the usage of the other poets and of the several works of Ovid.³

TABLE XI. — DISSYLLABIC PENTAMETER ENDINGS

Catullus		Tibullus*		Propertius		Ovid	
<i>carm.</i> 65-7	34.9%	Bk. 1	94.7%	Bk. 1	63.0%	<i>Amor.</i>	100.0%
<i>carm.</i> 68	52.5	Bk. 2	95.2	Bk. 2	88.1	<i>Her.</i> 1-15	100.0
<i>carm.</i> 69-116	37.1	* The figures for Bk. 3 are 94.5%.		Bk. 3	91.1	<i>Her.</i> 16-21	99.7
				Bk. 4	98.8	<i>A. A.</i>	100.0
				Bk. 5	98.8	<i>Rem.</i>	100.0
						<i>Med. Fac.</i>	100.0
						<i>Fast.</i>	99.9
						<i>Trist.</i>	99.6
						<i>Ex Pont.</i>	98.7
						<i>Ibis</i>	99.4

Here again Tibullus appears as an innovator, whose experiment of reducing the number of polysyllabic endings is taken up and developed

¹ Cf. Table V, p. 141.

² Cf. p. 154.

³ Cf. Hultgren, *op. cit.*, Tab. IX, XII, XIV, XIX.

by others. Propertius, to be sure, exhibits no very decided preference for the dissyllabic close until the later books, where he is under Ovid's influence¹; but Ovid goes to the length of excluding polysyllabic clausulae entirely in his early works,—if, for the moment, we leave *Heroides* 16–21 out of consideration,—while the exceptions in his later period are rare. This strictness of technic, however, deprives Ovid's pentameter of a desirable variety, and later poets who use the elegiac metre do not imitate his usage in this particular.² Therefore, for the purpose of testing the genuineness of the double letters, this peculiarity of Ovid is valuable, for it is probable that an imitator, observing this practice of his model, would have refrained altogether from the use of polysyllabic words, or, failing to observe it, would have used them more frequently than they appear in *Heroides* 16–21. In point of fact we find these letters agreeing with the usage of no other poet, but with Ovid's later verse. Our examination of the pentameter has, therefore, yielded rather more than was to be expected in the way of confirming the Ovidian authorship of the double letters, and strengthens the testimony of the hexameter.

To sum up the results of our study of Ovid's metre in its relation to the question of the genuineness of *Heroides* 16–21, we have found a surprising agreement between Ovid's surely genuine works in the following particulars: he uses (1) more dactyls and (2) more 'dactylic' verses than any other poet; he surpasses all other poets (3) in his use of dactyls in the first foot, so much so that (4) the eight most common forms of hexameter all begin with a dactyl. These characteristics, while displayed especially in the hexameter, are confirmed by the statistics for the pentameter. The double letters of the *Heroides* have all the marks which distinguish Ovid from other poets; and while we may still admit the possibility that an imitator, writing at a later date on the same subject as Ovid, should have caught his manner exactly, yet in the absence of any evidence making such a hypothesis necessary, the strong positive testimony of the metre to the genuineness of the

¹ Cf. Plessis, *Études critiques sur Propertius et ses élégies*, Paris, 1884, p. 294.

² Cf. Plessis, *Métrique grecque et latine*, pp. 123 f., who gives the following figures for polysyllabic clausulae in the pentameter: Lygdamus, 1 in 18 verses; Martial, 1 in 12–13; Claudian, 1 in 19–20; Rutilius Namatianus, 1 in 11; Ausonius, 1 in 3–4.

disputed *Heroides*, added to the fact that no usages alien to Ovid can be proved to exist in them, is surely sufficient to demonstrate that the poems are his work.

III

THE DATE OF *HEROIDES* 16-21

The subject matter of the letters is of no assistance in an effort to determine their date, the nature of the themes being such that we naturally find no mention of persons or events contemporary with the time of writing; we must, therefore, depend upon probability and such evidence as may be afforded by the language and metre of the poems. As far as the mere labor of composition is concerned it is clear at the outset that no time in the poet's life is an impossible date, for the letters contain less than 800 lines, and fluency is Ovid's most obvious characteristic; two or three months at any time would have been ample for the production of the six epistles. The most natural date to assume is that at which the single letters were written, since all have come down to us together and have the same title and subject matter; to many scholars, indeed, no other date has seemed possible. But the date of the single letters is itself uncertain, and we can only say that a collection of *Heroides* appeared at some time between 19 B.C. and 1 A.D. The *Ars Amatoria* and the *Remedia Amoris* we know to have been published between 1 B.C.¹ and 1 A.D.² Furthermore, Ovid in the *Ars Amatoria*³ speaks of the *Amores* and the *Epistulae* as already published. Now, nearly all scholars are agreed that the first edition of the *Amores* in five books appeared shortly after the death of Tibullus,⁴ in 19 B.C. A second edition, however, in three books, which we possess, was published at some later date, and included such of the poems of the earlier edition as the poet thought worthy of preservation, and also certain additions, among which is *Amores* 2, 18. In lines 19 ff. of this poem, as they are commonly interpreted, Ovid represents himself as engaged upon the *Ars Amatoria*—his words are, *artes teneri profite-*

¹ *A. A.* 1, 177; *Rem.* 155.

² Cf. Schanz, *Gesch. der röm. Litteratur*, § 293.

³ *A. A.* 3, 343-6.

⁴ Cf. *Amor.* 3, 9.

mur Amoris—and the *Epistulae Heroidum*, of which he mentions nine of the first fifteen. This was at the time when he published the second edition of the *Amores*, that is, not long before 1 B.C. However, by adopting the interpretation of these lines recently proposed by Professor E. K. Rand,¹ who refers *artes teneri profigitemur Amoris* not to the *Ars Amatoria*, but to the *Amores*, as also didactic, we may put the second edition of the *Amores* about 11 B.C. or even earlier, and still allow an abundance of time for correcting and adding to the earlier edition. Such a date agrees much better with what we know of Ovid's temperament, as it materially reduces the interval of time between the two editions of the *Amores*. We have then a period of ten years or more between the single letters, which antedate the final edition of the *Amores*, and the *Ars Amatoria*; during this time the poet may well have felt a renewed interest in the epistolary treatment of mythological heroines and have written the double letters.

We may still question whether the double letters may not with equal probability be assigned to a date after 1 A.D. Ovid was banished in 9 A.D., and the years from that time until his death are filled chiefly with a succession of complaints and appeals for mercy which manifest a constant decline in poetic vigor. It is extremely unlikely that a man so broken by misfortune should return again to the light trifles of his youth, especially to such as treat the subject of love, the very cause of his banishment, at a time of keen distress of mind and body. There remain the years 1-9 A.D., during which the *Metamorphoses* and the six books of the *Fasti* were composed. As has been remarked, the poet could readily have found time in this period for the composition of so slight a work as the double letters; indeed, they might easily have served the purpose of relaxation from the cares of more ambitious productions.

We have, then, to choose between these two periods, 11-1 B.C. and 1-9 A.D., neither of which seems in itself an impossible time to which to assign *Heroides* 16-21. The earlier period seems the more probable; it contains fewer works, and follows immediately after the time when Ovid wrote the first fifteen letters. To this view it has been objected by those who do not accept the double letters, that these six cannot

¹ *American Journal of Philology*, XXVIII (1907), pp. 287 ff.

belong with the first fifteen because of their greater length and because the three whose imaginary writers are men cannot be included under the title *Epistulae. Heroidum*. Lachmann further contended¹ that it is equally impossible to assign the disputed epistles to a later period in Ovid's life than that during which he wrote *Heroides* 1-15, since the poet would then have included in his collection the letter of Byblis, which now appears in the *Metamorphoses*.² This objection of course loses its force if we accept the earlier date for the second edition of the *Amores*, as there would still remain abundant time before the date of the *Metamorphoses* for the composition of the double letters, even if Ovid did not write them until several years after the completion of the first fifteen *Heroides*; in this case, it was probably the example of Sabinus that prompted Ovid to try his hand at both sides of a correspondence. At the same time, it is equally likely that his use of the epistolary setting to give variety to his treatment of the Byblis story may have awakened a desire to return to this literary form of his early period.³ In either case, the idea of giving the first letter of the correspondence to the man is due to Ovid's love of variety, which also accounts for the greater length of the double letters. Furthermore, Riese holds⁴ that the usages in the double *Heroides* which have awakened suspicion find support in Ovid's later works and present no difficulty if we assign the letters in question to the poet's maturer years. This view has naturally been opposed by those who reject the disputed epistles, but Bürger, while he does not himself accept it, admits the possibility of its truth,⁵ and Zingerle adopts Riese's conclusions⁶; Eschenburg, too, as we have already seen, is led by his later studies⁷ to abandon his earlier belief⁸

¹ *Kleinere Schriften*, II, p. 58.

² *Met.* 9, 530-63.

³ Cf. Rand, *Notes on Ovid*, in *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, vol. XXXV (1904), p. 129.

⁴ *Jahrb. f. Philologie*, 1874, I, p. 569, n. 9; *Jahresb.* III (1874-5), pp. 233-6; X (1877, II), p. 21.

⁵ Bürger, *De Ovidi carminum amatoriorum inventione et arte*, Guelferbyti, 1901, p. 47.

⁶ *Untersuchungen zur Echtheitsfrage der Heroiden Ovids*, Innsbruck, 1878, pp. 52 and 74.

⁷ *Wie hat Ovid*, etc.

⁸ *Metr. Untersuch.*

in the spuriousness of the double letters and accepts the view of Riese.¹

As there are, then, two dates possible for *Heroides* 16-21, we may review the arguments for both possibilities, to see whether we can declare definitely for either. In considering the objections of Lachmann and others to the metre and language of the double letters, we found that certain usages at variance with Ovid's earlier manner are justified by parallels in his later works; these include the use of *nihil* as a pyrrhic,² of polysyllabic words at the close of the pentameter,³ and the elision of a long syllable in the third thesis.⁴ Hultgren, moreover, finds in the structure of the verse a guide in determining the date of composition. He remarks⁵: *Non temere igitur contenditur, ex structura distichi . . . plus minusve dactylica summam conjecturas fieri posse de tempore quo carmina confecta sunt. Auctore enim Ovidio dubitari amplius nequit quin poetarum elegiacorum poemata, minus dactylice in principio distichi constructa, inter opera juvenilis aetatis referenda, carmina autem cum plurimis initiis dactylicis florenti aetati adnumeranda sint.* A reference to Table VIII⁶ will show that as regards the use of the dactyl in the first place of the hexameter the double letters agree fairly closely with the later works of Ovid, while the single letters are in harmony with his earlier writings. In the case of the pentameter, however,⁷ the difference between the two periods is less marked, and the *Amores* and the *De Medicamine Faciei* agree as nearly with the late as with the early works, so that no safe deduction can be drawn. Ovid's preference for certain verse-forms also seems to have varied at different periods, for while the common order of forms in the pentameter is *ds, dd, sd, ss* in the early works, the later writings usually show *ds, dd, ss, sd*; with the latter *Heroides* 16-21 agree. Here again, however, *Amores* 3 forms an exception to the rule, and affects the average for the entire work to such an extent that the *Amores* as a whole agree with the later works⁸; *Tristia* 1, also, shows the same order of verse-forms as the early writings, though the average for the entire five books presents no exception.

¹ Cf. his words quoted on p. 131.

² Cf. p. 126.

³ Cf. pp. 126, 127; also Table XI, p. 149.

⁴ Cf. p. 128.

⁵ *Observ. metr.*, I, p. 29.

⁶ Cf. p. 147.

⁷ Cf. Table X, p. 148.

⁸ Cf. Table X, p. 148.

The theory of an early date does not perhaps offer so many positive arguments; its strength lies rather in its greater general probability, and in the weakness of the opposing view; for it appears very unlikely that Ovid, with his many-sided talent and love of novelty, should have felt a revived interest in the *Heroides* so many years after the completion of the single letters, while a second treatment of the same general subject soon after the first success, with the letters longer and in pairs, is quite in keeping with the poet's mental habits. The inappropriateness of the title *Epistulae Heroidum* to the three letters by men need not prove a serious objection, since two collections of letters of so similar a nature and not differing greatly in date could easily have become fused under the title of the earlier and larger work.¹ Further, the original title has still a certain appropriateness; the double letters are virtually "Letters of Heroines," since the men's letters serve merely as introductions, giving us the setting, while our interest centres in the replies which the women will make to the appeals of their lovers. It may further be urged against the arguments used to support the theory of a later date of composition that the agreements noted between the double letters and Ovid's later works are chiefly with the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, productions of a time when it is almost certain that the poet did not write love poetry and hence of little value as proof of date. Moreover, the arguments from metre, as we have observed, are so qualified by exceptions as greatly to weaken their force.

Neither side of the case admits of absolute proof. The facts are too few to form the basis of a safe conclusion; probabilities may be found for either view, though they favor the early date. Such being our present information, it is better to suspend judgment, in the hope that further investigation may decide, with the help of new material, when Ovid wrote the double letters of the *Heroides*.

¹ Cf. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, Berlin, 1882, pp. 379 f.